

### Remarks

Claims 1-5 and 7-9 were pending in the above-identified application when last examined. Claim 1-5 and 7-9 are rejected. Claims 1-5 and 7-9 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

### Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 5 and 8-9 as being anticipated by Yamaguchi (US 5,917,976). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

It is axiomatic that "[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration." *W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. V. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Therefore, every claimed feature of the claimed invention must be represented in the applied reference to constitute a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

The Examiner states:

Yamaguchi discloses an optical assembly comprising a package including an optoelectronic component (Fig. 9, element 32); an alignment feature mounted to the surface of the package (31); and **a sleeve (33) defining only one bore (37)** with an inner surface having a constant inner diameter for receiver and contacting outer surfaces of the alignment feature (microlens) and a ferrule of a **fiber (31)** of a fiber connector when the alignment feature and the ferrule are inserted into the bore at opposite ends of the bore so they can be aligned relative to each other (Fig. 9, 11 see also col. 13 line 30 to col. 14, line 25).

(See Office Action, page 2; Emphasis added)

Applicants point out that the Examiner states that labeled feature (33) is a sleeve. The feature labeled (33) is a micro-lens array not a sleeve (See Yamaguchi, column 13, line 49). Applicants also point out that the Examiner states that the labeled feature (31) is a ferrule of a fiber. The feature labeled (31) is a substrate not a ferrule of a fiber (See Yamaguchi, column 13, line 50). For the sake of the following discussion, Applicants refer to a micro-lens array labeled (33) and a substrate labeled (31).

In the present case, not every feature of claims 1 and 2 are represented in the Yamaguchi reference. Applicants respectfully submit that Yamaguchi does not disclose a sleeve defining **only one bore** with an inner surface having a constant inner diameter for receiving and contacting outer surfaces of the alignment feature. Figure 11 of Yamaguchi shows a labeled feature (37) with more than one bore (See Yamaguchi, col. 14, line 10). Yamaguchi describes feature (37) as guides holes (See Yamaguchi, col. 14, line 10). For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that Yamaguchi does not anticipate Applicants' claims 1 and 2. Therefore, for at least the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Regarding claim 5, the Examiner states that the alignment feature (33) comprises a solid partial sphere. As discussed above, the labeled feature (33) shown in Figure 9 is a micro-lens array not an alignment feature. The micro-lens array 33 does not show a solid partial sphere. Rather, the micron-lens array shown in Figure 12 comprises a plurality of micro-lenses. For at least the above reason, Applicants

respectfully assert that Yamaguchi does not anticipate Applicants' claim 5. Therefore, for at least the above reason, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Dependent claims 8 and 9 further define patentably distinct independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claims 8 and 9 are also believed to be allowable. For at least the above reason, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

### **Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner rejected claims 3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi in view of Freeman (US 5,195,156). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Dependent claims 3 and 7 further define patentably distinct independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claims 3 and 7 are also believed to be allowable. For at least the above reason, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi in view of Gilliland et al. (US 6,416,238 B1). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Dependent claims 4 further defines patentably distinct independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claim 4 is also believed to be allowable. For at least the above

reason, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

### **Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' pending claims (1-5 and 7-9) are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

January 29, 2009

/John Pessetto/

John R. Pessetto, Reg. No. 48,369  
KLAAS, LAW, O'MEARA & MALKIN, P.C.  
1999 Broadway, Suite 2225  
Denver, Colorado 80201-1920  
Tel. (303) 298-9888  
Fax (303) 297-2266